

## REMARKS

The Official Action dated 17 May 2007 has been carefully considered, along with cited references, applicable sections of the Patent Act, Patent Rules, the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure and relevant decisional law.

Claim 2 is objected to because of the following informalities: line 3, “of” should be “off”. Appropriate correction is required.

In response, claim 2 has been amended accordingly.

Claims 1-4, 7, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by USP 5,814,114 (Stueble).

Claims 1, 10, 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by US 2005/0000055 to Cheng (Cheng).

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over USP 5,814,114 (Stueble).

However, the Examiner has kindly indicated that claims 5, 8, and 9 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if written in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In response, claim 8 which is indicated to be allowable has been deleted, and has been included into claim 1. Claims 2 and 7 to which claim 8 is dependent thereon have also been deleted and have also been included into claim 1.

Claims 3 and 9 have been amended to be dependent on the amended claim 1. Claims 4 and 6 are dependent on claim 3.

Claim 5 which is indicated to be allowable has been written in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 10 is dependent on the amended claim 1. Claim 11 is dependent on claim 10.

Accordingly, claims 1, 3-6, 9-11 would appear to be allowable, and early issuance of a Notice of Allowance is accordingly most respectfully solicited.

Courtesy and cooperation of Examiner REDDING are appreciated.

respectfully submitted,

By: Charles E. Baxley

CHARLES E. BAXLEY

Attorney of Record

USPTO Reg. 20,149

90 John Street – 3rd Floor

New York, N.Y. 10038

TEL: (212) 791-7200

FAX: (212) 791-7276

Date: New York, N.Y.